REMARKS

The Office Action, dated May 2, 2005, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claims 1-42 remain in this application, and claims 1, 39 and 40 are in independent form.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has withdrawn the rejections of claims 1-42 in view of the Henneuse patent and the Leyba Patent. Instead, the Examiner now rejects claims 1-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,313 to Salesky et al. (hereinafter "the Salesky patent"). In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections.

Independent claim 1 of the present application is directed to a method for conducting at least one convention by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client. This method includes the steps of: receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions; receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions; and releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information.

Independent claim 39 of the present application is directed to a method for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client. In this claim, the method includes the steps of: receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions; receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions; receiving at the central website from the

attendee client information necessary to register for the convention; and releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information.

Independent claim 40 of the present application is directed to a system for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client. The system includes means for receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and means for electronically storing at a central website, convention content information for a plurality of conventions. In addition, the system includes means for receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions, and means for releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee client the selected convention content information.

In general, the Salesky patent is directed to a computer conferencing system having real-time, multipoint, multi-speed and multi-stream scalability. In today's Internet language, the Salesky patent is referred to as describing a real-time webcast system. The Abstract of the Salesky patent offers: "An improved networked computer communications system handles arbitrary streams of data, and transports at varying speeds those streams where intermediate updates can be dropped if they are obsoleted by later arriving data updates, optimizing the utilization of network and node resources. Complex buffering by system server software allows distributed, parallel, or redundant processing, transmission, and storage for performance, reliability, and robustness." The Salesky patent provides a precise visual shared-display or shared-image conferencing system that "facilitates the conferencing of two or more persons, each with a computer at one or more locations with a shared visual display and additional communication capabilities such as video, shared drawing, audio, text chat, etc., and facilitates the recording and later playback of the communications" (col 1, lines 13-18). Prior to

the Salesky patent, it has been recognized that "[e]xisting shared-display or shared-image systems rely on interception and communication of display or graphics system commands or depend on conferees having similar hardware and software platforms" (col 1, lines 36-39).

There are many significant differences between the invention of the present application and the systems and methods of the prior art, including the Salesky patent. As a general background to claimed method and system, and as discussed in the Response to the previous Office Action, it is submitted that the present invention is directed to the technology behind how the meeting planner client and the exhibitor client can themselves, separately and interactively, encode a relational database with *functional descriptive* material and operate their distinct aspects of a virtual convention website with database updating processing and dynamic page information display, without any web-page-publishing or website programming (e.g., via HTML or similar) skills, but rather solely web browser skills. The meeting planner client can also set convention operational control parameter rules to customize the operation or processing flow of the virtual navigational experience of the exhibitor clients or attendee clients. The present invention provides a precise technology, where the meeting planner client and the exhibitor client can themselves separately self-develop, encode and fully maintain, through central website database-server program instruction control, single or multiple-show or virtual convention website processes. The present invention further defines the technology behind how the end user clients of the convention or show process can interactively create and operate such websites.

It is further submitted that the present invention addresses the underlying technology for supporting the arrangement of integrated and centralized convention relationships or channels of multiple conventions (i.e., one-to-many and many-to-many) without the use of webmaster programmers or website development firms. These channels can be used for multiple

shows or conventions for an individual show operator or a solitary non-profit association, or larger, a comprehensive-industry-wide website service, where all industry-wide shows and conventions (made up by single shows or conventions) are contained at a central website service site with relational database capabilities.

Prior to the Applicant's invention, no Internet-based application service provider ("ASP") or hosted systems existed that would permit meeting planners or tradeshow organizers within the meetings, convention and trade show industry, including exhibitors and attendees to:

(i)   interactively conduct purely 100% cyber-based conventions;

(ii)   augment venue-based conventions with an Internet-based experience; or

(iii)   host "combined" cyber- and venue-based conventions.

In addition, prior to the present invention, tradeshow websites were custom built by webmaster programmers for single-specific conventions. Meeting planners or tradeshow organizers within the meetings, convention and tradeshow industries could not, themselves, interactively encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and operate single convention websites with solely web browser skills. Likewise, exhibitors within the meetings, convention and tradeshow industries could not, themselves, interactively encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and add virtual booths at a single convention website with solely web browser skills. Meeting planners or tradeshow organizers could not, themselves, interactively create multiple or unlimited conventions at a website using relational database cross-referencing fields, thereby minimizing data entry tasks while maximizing attendee browsing functions based upon a wide array of functional descriptive material. Fundamentally, the meeting planners or tradeshow organizers could not interactively create, themselves, integrated centralized conventions switches or channels in an end-user controlled framework. Exhibitors could not, themselves, interactively create and add virtual booths across multiple

conventions within integrated centralized convention channels, thereby providing master purchasing agreement capabilities with the meeting planners or tradeshow organizers.

A significant technical problem associated with the prior art is loading and operating conventions, which has been solved by the present invention. In particular, the present invention implements numerous inventive steps, for example facilitating how a meeting planner client interactively loads convention content information for a single convention, and for a plurality of conventions. There are significant and inventive steps not only in receiving and storing convention content information, but the control parameter rules of how a specific convention will operate. There are even more inventive steps directed to how a plurality of conventions are interactively loaded and provided in terms of the virtual convention experience for the attendee client.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious about receiving from an attendee client a selection for convention content information from the plurality of conventions after such convention content information is loaded by a meeting planner client. The database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such a selection and releasing appropriate content for such a selection is novel and requires nonobvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, for example processing controlled by the parameter rules included in the functional descriptive material for the attendee client's navigational experience.

The Salesky patent discloses and claims a conferencing system. For example, independent claim 1 of the Salesky patent is as follows:

1. A conferencing system comprising:

at least one client;

a conference server;

network connections between the conference server and the at least one client, wherein the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a display, wherein the conference server updates said version of said shared portion of said display with data updates, after taking into consideration the network connections speeds and loads and client computing speeds and loads, wherein the conference server is capable of delivering the data updates in an output data type selected from base uncompressed data, base compressed data, differenced uncompressed data and differenced compressed data, and wherein the output data type is selected based on the network connections speeds and loads, conference server computing speeds and loads, and client computing speeds and loads, and wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting said shared portion of said display to two or more clients in parallel.

Further, independent claim 2 of the Salesky patent is as follows:

2. A conferencing system comprising:

at least one client;

a conference server;

network connections between the conference server and the at least one client, wherein the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a data set, wherein the conference server updates said version of said shared portion of said data set with data updates after taking into consideration the network connections speeds and loads and client computing speeds and loads, wherein the conference server is capable of delivering the data updates in an output data type selected from base uncompressed data, base compressed data, differenced uncompressed data and differenced compressed data, and wherein the output data type is selected based on the network connections speeds and loads, conference server computing speeds and loads, and client computing speeds and loads, and wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting said shared portion of said data set to two or more clients in parallel.

Reading closely the above claims of the Salesky patent, it appears that the at least one client <u>maintains a version of a shared portion</u> of a screen display, or shared portion of a data set, and the conference server transmits <u>those said portions with two or more clients in parallel</u> – while the server performs communications-related data stream controls, such as network speed and loads changes, compression, decompression, and output data type manipulations. In today's Internet language, the system of the Salesky patent is referred to as a real-time webcast system, and in the Salesky patent, the term "broadcast" is used in a similar fashion as the term "webcast" (col 7, line 17), (col 14, line 55), (col 23, line 24), and (col 25, line 17). The term "transmitting" is used in both Claim 1 and Claim 2 of the Salesky patent. Thus, the Salesky patent is a shared-display and shared-data set communications system between PCs in parallel – a real-time webcast system.

The Salesky patent is *not* related to the invention of the present application, which describes methods for conducting conventions by facilitating an exchange between meeting planner clients and attendee clients, where convention content information is received from a meeting planner client, a selection is received from an attendee client and information is released to the attendee client. The Salesky patent does not discuss the application service provider or ASP model of the present invention. The clients-in-parallel shared-display communications webcast system, as described in the Salesky patent, is not comparable to Applicant's unaccompanied-clients-not-in-parallel ASP-based convention system. The system and method claimed by the Salesky patent, performed in its normal and usual operation, does not perform the system and method claimed by Applicant. Still further, there is nothing inherent about receiving from an attendee client a selection for convention content information from the plurality of conventions after such convention content information, including functional descriptive material, is loaded by a meeting planner client.

In the present invention, the database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving a selection and releasing appropriate content for such a selection is novel and requires nonobvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, including but not limited by processing controlled by the parameter rules for the attendee client's navigational experience. As set forth in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) 2106(IV)(B)(1)(a), "a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized" is statutory. It is submitted that Applicant's claimed convention content information is encoded with the data structure of the virtual convention venue databases and the website program instructions, which *defines functional and structural interrelationships* between the meeting planner client and the attendee client, the data structure and website program instructions (e.g., computer software), and the data storage device, CPU and network interface (e.g., hardware components), which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized.

The convention content information and data structures of the method and system of the present invention are embodied in computer-readable media and cause functional change in the computer. Thus, Applicant's convention content information should be considered *functional descriptive* material in terms of patentability and is evidence establishing a nonobvious difference between the claimed invention and the method and system of the Salesky patent, particularly in view of its normal and usual operations. *See also* MPEP 2106(VI).

Referring now to the Examiner's detailed rejection of the claims of the present application, and in particular Paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "convention means coming together, as a group of people meeting in one place, col 7, lines 1-4, fig 1, 18 (a-c), 12)". However, the conferencing system of the Salesky patent is not comparable

to a "method for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client", as specifically claimed in the present application. Neither the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teaches or suggests methods and systems for "conducting" conventions, as specifically set forth in the independent claims 1, 39 and 40 of the present application. None of Applicant's terms "conducting", "convention" or "conventions" appear anywhere in the Salesky patent; and, there are many additional and detailed differences between the invention of the present application and the above references, such as the Examiner's contention that convention means coming together, as a group of people meeting in one place. Accordingly, the Salesky patent does not define, disclose, teach or suggest "method for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client", as claimed in the present application.

It is further submitted that the term "convention", as used in the claims of the present application, is not taught or suggested in the prior art. The Examiner defines the term "convention" as "coming together, as a group of people <u>meeting</u> in one place". Contradicting the Examiner's interpretation, however, at column 2, lines 25-28 of the Salesky patent, a clear and invention-description-constant definition of the term "<u>meeting</u>" is directed to the use of the computer communications and computer conferencing *session* as follows: "<u>In the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a 'meeting.'</u>" Therefore, throughout the entire Salesky patent, the term "meeting" is a "computer communications or other conferencing session" and not a "group of people" as offered by the Examiner. It should be noted that the patent drafter is his or her own lexicographer, and that the use of terms in the patent must be consistent.

Further, at column 29, lines 30-31 of the Salesky patent, the reader further finds "this architecture to accomplish the communications serving functions" followed at column 29, lines 39-40 with specifications of ways "in which the invention can accomplish multiple simultaneous communications sessions" where "[t]he meeting is directly supervised by communications session server ("CSS")" (col 29, lines 59-60). Therefore, the above computer communications session "meeting" definition and specifications, together with the earlier close reading and discussion of the claims of the Salesky patent, further supports the classification that the Salesky patent is a real-time shared-display and shared-data set communications system, where "the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a display" (col 35, lines 34-35) or where "the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a data set" (col 35, lines 56-57) – "wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting said shared portion of said display to two or more clients in parallel" (col 35, lines 49-50) or correspondingly "wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting said shared portion of said data set to two or more clients in parallel" (col 36, lines 3-5). Such a computer conferencing system with real-time multipoint, multi-speed, multi-stream scalability – where the at least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a display, or shared portion of a data set, while transmitting to other clients in parallel (i.e., an improved shared-display "whiteboard" (col 1, line 19) and webcast system) - is not comparable to a "method for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client" in the present application, where the clients participate in an application service provider ("ASP") or hosted system that permits meeting planners themselves, to interactively encode a relational database with functional descriptive material and operate single convention websites with solely web browser skills. With these references from the Salesky patent the Examiner can respectfully appreciate that Applicant's unaccompanied-clients-not-in-

parallel ASP-based convention system is not comparable to the clients-in-parallel shared-display webcast system as described in the Salesky patent.

In further analysis of Column 7, lines 1-4, and Figs. 1, 18 (a-c) and 12 of the Salesky patent, as referenced by the Examiner, this portion of the specification of the Salesky patent reads as follows: "[d]esktop conferencing system 10 is shown with three attendee clients 18 and one presenter client 12. Following the arrows, presenter client 12 is connected to attendee client 18 through a conference server 14 and data network 16." (emphasis added). Corresponding Fig 1. of the Salesky patent provides a block diagram representation of referenced column 7, lines 1-4 with a "Legend:" defining the arrowed lines as "Data connection". Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary definition of the word "connected" is "1 : joined or linked together 2 : having the parts or elements logically linked together". This part of the reference (col 7, lines 1-4) is descriptive and supportive of the shared-display and shared-data set webcasting communications aspects in the Salesky patent in that: 1) the clients are "joined and linked together" (Webster) in a real-time communications data network; and 2) the clients plus the "shared portion of a display" (col 35, line 36) or "shared portion of a data set" (col 35, line 57) are "the parts or elements logically linked together" (Webster), "wherein the conference server is capable of transmitting" ((col 35, lines 48-49) and (col 36, lines 3-4)) across the data network.

A transmitting or broadcasting system for connecting clients with a shared-portion of a display or shared-portion of a data set through a conference server and a real-time data network does not have the same meaning and is not the same as conducting a convention, as set forth in the claims of the present application. Notwithstanding Applicant's detailed specification, the verb root "conduct" has primary definition, according to Webster, meaning "to bring by or as if by leading". Therefore, Applicant's claim can be interpreted as "A method to

bring by, or as if by leading, the convention …", whereas, the Salesky patent's use of the verb/adjective "is connected" (col 7, line 3) in this Examiner's reference has a primary definition, according to Webster the meaning is "joined or linked together". These two divergent words, "connecting" from the Salesky patent and "conducting" from the present application, have significantly different meanings and practice. Accordingly, the Salesky patent at (col 7, lines 1-4, fig 1, 18(a-c), 12) does not define, disclose, teach or suggest "method for conducting at least one convention, by facilitating the exchange between at least one meeting planner client and at least one attendee client" as claimed in the present application.

Still further, neither the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record do teach or suggest "receiving", as defined and set forth in the independent claims of the present application. In particular, Applicant submits that the term "receiving" is not used in the Salesky patent at column 29, lines 62-63. Instead, the Salesky patent reads: "When server manager 36 receives a command from meeting manager 32 that includes the information on a meeting". These two lines at column 29, lines 62-63 are taken out of context and are incomplete. Earlier from the same paragraph cited one can find the definition of "meeting manager" found in the Salesky patent at column 29, lines 48-51 with "Meeting manager 32 is an unowned, quiescent, resident, interrupt-driven process (similar to a "daemon" process used with Unix and other operating systems)."

From The Unix Information Project, Copyright 2004-2005, http://www.bellevuelinux.org/process.html, the following explanation is given: "A daemon is a process that runs continuously in the background, rather than under the direct control of a user." Reading an expanded or complete text of the Salesky patent at column 29, lines 54-65, we find "The server manager is also an unowned, quiescent, resident, interrupt-driven process. Each CPU that is involved in the system for providing server functions in meetings set up by a

meeting manager has exactly one server manager running on it; that server manager can be viewed as the meeting manager's agent on that CPU. The meeting is directly supervised by communications session server ("CSS") 40(a), called here "Meeting #1 'Product Support.'" When server manager 36 receives a command from meeting manager 32 that includes the information on a meeting and on the first conferee that wishes to connect, the server manager creates a CSS to handle the meeting. The CSS is an owned, evanescent, quiescent, interrupt-driven process." Therefore, when server manager "receives" a command in the Salesky patent at column 29, lines 62-63, the command is an unowned, quiescent, resident, interrupt-driven process or "daemon" process, clearly defined and termed "meeting manager" at column 29, lines 48-51. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the term "receives" as part of an unmanned and unowned communications server interrupt process, as referenced by the Examiner in the Office action, is not comparable to and conflicts with Applicant's term "receiving" used within a step of a live person's functional data input to an ASP system.

Still further, the Salesky patent and/or any of the prior art of record do not teach or suggest the limitation: "from the at least one meeting planner client" nor the Applicant's "and electronically storing at a central website", as set forth in the independent claims of the present application, with respect to the Examiner's separately-used but same reference (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24). In particular, Applicant submits that the terms and specification "meeting planner client" and "storing at a central website" are not used in the Salesky patent at column 30, lines 15-24. Instead, the Salesky patent reads: "A potential conferee 17(a) has navigated his or her WWW browser to Web server 30(a), and has asked through the Web page presented to connect to the meeting (as described above in the discussion of FIG. 2). There may be alternative ways, indicated here as 30(b), (c), to connect to the meeting, including direct access to the meeting manager or its database 34 (called here "Meeting DB"). The meeting

manager uses this database to hold information concerning the meeting (the database need not be on the same computer as the meeting manager)." (emphasis added).

At column 1, lines 52-55 of the Salesky patent, the definition for "conferee" is "[t]he desktop conferencing system is used to display a shared collaboration among conference participants ("conferees"), with one or more individuals located at each remote site connected to the conference." The present application defines the "meeting planner client" as follows: "The term meeting planner client is also used in a manner similar to current use in the convention industry to designate an individual (or association) that organizes and manages the convention, event, conference or trade show." Further, Applicant specifies the ASP client processing functions of the invention for the meeting planner client: "Further interpretation on meeting planners work can be obtained from Meeting Professionals International (MPI) located in Dallas, TX.". Hence, the reference (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24) is not comparable to Applicant's "meeting planner client" in terms of definition, convention industry recognized scope, or work-flow activities.

Again, at column 2, lines 25-28 of the Salesky patent, the definition of the term "meeting" is used in connection with the computer communications and computer conferencing session - "[i]n the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a 'meeting.'" Therefore, "meeting" is a webcast "computer communications or other conferencing session" in the Salesky patent. And, as discussed earlier, the definition of "meeting manager" was found in the Salesky patent at column 29, lines 48-51 to mean as follows: "[m]eeting manager 32 is an unowned, quiescent, resident, interrupt-driven process (similar to a "daemon" process used with Unix and other operating systems)." The reference cited here by the Examiner (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24) is a "potential conferee" connecting to the "architecture to accomplish the

{W0197374.1}

communications serving functions" (col 29, lines 30-31). Clearly the reference is discussing ways "to connect to the meeting" at column 30, lines 19-20 in terms of the "computer conferencing or other communications session" (col 2, lines 25-28). And the reference at column 30, lines 18-20 states that "[t]here may be alternative ways, indicated here as 30(b), (c), to connect to the meeting, including direct access to the meeting manager" which is again "to connect" to the "meeting manager", which was defined in the Salesky patent as "an unowned, quiescent, resident, interrupt-driven process" (col 29, lines 48-51).

The "potential conferee" is "connecting" in the Salesky patent – this is not comparable to the "meeting planner" "storing" of the present application. The "potential conferee" is "connecting" to a "session", or alternatively to an "interrupt-driven process" in the Salesky patent – this is not comparable to the "meeting planner" "storing" at a "central website". Hence, combining references (col 29, lines 62) and (potential conferee, col 30, lines 15-24) does not teach the subject matter or claim terms addressed in "from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing at a central website" of the present application.

Still further, the Salesky patent does not teach or suggest "convention content", as set forth in all of independent claims 1, 39 and 40. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner may have misinterpreted Applicant's use of the term "convention content" in the present application, and the term "meeting content" used by the Examiner in the Office action. Respectfully, the term "meeting contents" (col. 24, lines 66-67) of the Salesky patent and the term "convention content information" in the present application are not comparable.

Please note that the Examiner inadvertently cited "meeting content" at column 24, lines 66-67. The original term of the Salesky patent actually appears in a plural form as "meeting contents" at column 24, lines 66-67. It is also important to further note that "meeting contents" appears only twice in the Salesky patent, both times in the paragraph at column 24, line

66 through column 25, line 10, and appears as mere naming of subject matter – not at all descriptive of or comparable to "convention content information" of the present application.

The first time the term "meeting contents" appears with the adjective "stored" (col. 24, line 66), therefore rendering "stored meeting contents", and then the second time the term appears with the adjective "recorded" (col. 25, line 9), rendering "recorded meeting contents". The Salesky patent was describing stored recordings of a conferencing or other communications session data streams at this reference, as the Salesky patent explains further.

A closer inspection of the Salesky patent indicates "stored meeting contents" (col. 24, lines 66-67) to be stored recordings of communications session data streams. Starting with the background of the invention in the Salesky patent, computer communications and computer conferencing, and recording and playback teachings at column 1, lines 9-17 indicate that "[t]he present invention relates generally to the field of shared computer communications and computer conferencing. In particular, one embodiment of a conferencing system according to the present invention facilitates the conferencing of two or more persons, each with a computer at one or more locations with a shared visual display and additional communication capabilities such as video, shared drawing, audio, text chat, etc., and facilitates the recording and later playback of the communications." At column 2, lines 25-28, the clear and invention-description-constant definition of the term "meeting" used in the Salesky patent for the computer communications and computer conferencing session is as follows: "In the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a 'meeting.'"

The reader finds an extensive explanation for the session/meeting recording storage and playback services earlier at column 23, lines 14-27 of the Salesky patent, where "conference sessions are recorded when they are primarily intended for later viewing by users of

the system who may or may not be participating in the session; an archival session captures all or part of a meeting as it occurs and is intended for users who typically were conferees in that session and have a reason to review the session later. Uses of recorded sessions, especially when they incorporate synchronized voice, include live online training sessions that also serve for future offline training, technical and marketing demonstrations, and formal presentations that can be broadcast or accessed remotely at will. Archived sessions have uses other than review, including briefing absentees, capturing interactions involving or aiding technical support, evaluating sales personnel, and the like." These stored recordings of session data streams are further explained at column 23, lines 34-36 of the Salesky patent with "During any session, there can be multiple "storage server" queues, or "storage streams," saving output to one or more media."

Based on the above description from the Salesky patent, the Applicant respectfully submits that the meaning of the term "meeting contents" at column 24, lines 66-67 of the Salesky patent was clearly and specifically used in connection with the stored recordings of a conferencing or other communications session data streams. The meaning of "meeting content", taken out of context and in singular form by the Examiner, renders a different meaning than "meeting contents" at column 24, lines 66-67. Applicant respectfully submits that "meeting content" used by the Examiner in the Office action nor "meeting contents" at column 24, lines 55-67 are not comparable to and conflicts with Applicant's term "convention content information". Accordingly, the Salesky patent does not define, disclose, teach or suggest "convention content information" as specifically set forth in the independent claims of the present application. The use of the term "meeting contents" in the Salesky patent is mere naming or description of the stored recordings of the communications session data streams, and is not an assertedly anticipating reference and does not provide an enabling disclosure of the

applicant's subject matter which is comprehensively supported by functional descriptive material.

Further, Applicant's "convention content" cited by the Examiner is a component of the complete defined term "convention content information" in Applicant's specification and claims. As defined throughout the present application, the term "convention content information", as used in the present application defines extensive functional descriptive material. This functional descriptive material supports Applicant's contention that there are multiple nonobvious and distinguishing differences between the claimed invention and the Salesky patent. Specifically, the present application includes multiple virtual convention venue databases **300**, and the conventions database **350** includes computer program-defined fields for "convention content information". Such functional descriptive material, as set forth throughout the specification and claims of the present application is not taught or suggested in the Salesky patent or any of the prior art of record, and is not part of its normal and usual operation. Without such functional descriptive material, it is impossible for the process of the Salesky patent to carry out the present invention in normal operation.

Still further, none of the Salesky patent and/or any of the prior art of record teach or suggest "a plurality of conventions", as set forth in the independent claims of the present application. In particular, Applicant submits that the term "several meetings" used in the Salesky patent at column 29, lines 34-37 means <u>several communications sessions</u>. This usage and meaning was initiated in the preceding sentence with "the architecture to accomplish the communications serving functions" (col 29, lines 30-31), plus the Salesky patents' earlier and only definition at column 2, lines 25-28 of the term <u>"meeting"</u> for the computer communications and computer conferencing *session* with <u>"In the description below, a conferencing or other communications session provided by the present invention will sometimes be called a</u>

'meeting.'" Also, the immediately following sentences at column 29, lines 37-42 from the Salesky patent point to, by both use and meaning, "communications sessions" in an "image-sharing" system with "Again, the description of this method is not intended to suggest that this is the only way in which the invention can accomplish multiple simultaneous communications sessions. Any references to the image-sharing example should be extended to arbitrary data steams." The Applicant's "plurality of conventions" in a convention system, rooted with functional descriptive material, is not comparable to the reference "several meetings" (col 29, lines 34-37) – used for "simultaneous communications sessions" (col 29, lines 37-40) in the Salesky patent.

Also, the Examiner references, in Paragraph 7 of the Office Action, elements 17, 14; fig 2; column 8, lines 34-41 and column 8, lines 34-45 of the Salesky patent. These portions of the Salesky patent are not comparable to Applicant's "b. receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client (17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41) a selection for convention content information of one convention from the plurality of conventions (col 8, lines 34-45)". Examination of the paragraph at column 8, lines 30-54, which includes the above Examiner line references, indicates that "FIG. 2 is a flowchart showing the process of introducing a conferee client 17 (client 17 refers to a generic client which might also be a presenter client 12 or an attendee client 18) to a conference ongoing on server 14, assuming that the conference setup is performed via the WWW. First, the conferee locates a conference listing. This may be done by finding or being told a URL or using a locator service such as ULS™ or LDAP™. The conferee also specifies an icon to be used as a pointer label. Then the conferee points a WWW browser to the conference listing, where the server offering this listing or an associated server validates the conferee and provides information that allows the attendee client conferencing software to start and to connect to conference server 14 itself, possibly after further validation. Other information

may be passed to the conferee client at this time as well. The connection to a server can also be accomplished in different ways, such as using stored parameters that allow meetings to be resumed after the network connection is temporarily broken, or using client software having a hard-coded list of meetings. Once the attendee client software is running, it communicates commands and pointer icon position to conference server 14, and conference server 14 supplies an initial conference image and later screen updates to client 17 (which is initially an attendee client 18)." (emphasis added).

As fully remarked upon by the Applicant earlier herein, the term "meeting contents" (col. 24, lines 66-67) of the Salesky patent and the term "convention content information" in the present application are not comparable. At this point in the Salesky patent, the conferee client 17 is linking to the conference server 14 to start and to connect (i.e., software handshake process) to the real-time webcast conferencing system. This basic connecting handshake process is not comparable the Applicant's "receiving at the central website from the at least one attendee client a selection for convention content information". Specifically, at column 8, lines 41-43 "that allows the attendee client conferencing software to start and to connect to conference server 14 itself" the reader finds the software handshake. Back at column 1, line 4 of the Salesky patent, the reader also finds this "connect" handshake to and definition of the "conference server" "running conferencing software" with: "In a specific implementation of the desktop conferencing system, conferee client computers ("conferee clients") connect to the "conference server," a computer or several networked computers (any of which may also be used by a conferee as a client computer) running conferencing software". After such connection to the communications conference server, the purpose, process and system of the parallel-users is the simultaneous webcast found in claims 1 and 2 of the Salesky patent with:

"1. A conferencing system comprising:

at least one client;

a conference server;

network connections between the conference server and the at least one client, wherein the at

least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a display"

or,

"2. A conferencing system comprising:

at least one client;

a conference server;

network connections between the conference server and the at least one client, wherein the at

least one client maintains a version of a shared portion of a data set"

The Examiner's specific reference (17, 14, fig 2, col 8, lines 35-45, server

provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the

conference) opposite Applicant's "releasing from the central website to the at least one attendee

client the selected convention content information is also not comparable. Close examination of

Fig. 2 of the Salesky patent, the reader can observe from the START, the Conferee locates

WWW URL for a conference, Conferee selects an icon, Conferee points browser to conference

URL, provides keyword if needed. Then, with the first control arrow going to the Conference

server, the reader observes "Conference URL script provides link to conference server; Conferee

is validated". The next arrow takes control back to the Conferee client, where the Conferee

computer initiates system client software. Then the Conferee (System) client connects to the

system server with commands, pointer position, screen updates and other services related to the

communications webcast processes between the Conferee client 17 and the Conference server

14. The term "information" at Examiner referenced column 8, lines 35-45 appears only twice –

"where the server offering this listing or an associated server validates the conferee and provides information that allows the attendee client conferencing software to start and to connect to conference server 14 itself, possibly after further validation. Other information may be passed to the conferee client at this time as well." Reading sequentially, the providing or passing of such "information" is after the conferee is validated, and therefore, refers to the communications webcast information represented by two-way arrows on FIG 2. of the Salesky patent of "Commands", "Pointer position", "Screen updates" and "Other services". This Examiner's reference is immediately followed by the words (col 8, lines 45-46) "The connection to a server can also be accomplished in different ways, such as" - which again is supportive that the use of the term "information" at this point of the specification of the Salesky patent is related to "the connection" in terms of the communications webcast process. Finally, the words found at column 8, lines 48-49 "or using client software having a hard-coded list of meetings" is indicative of a source-programmed list of meetings and not a stored database of convention content information found in the Applicant's invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that "server provides information" as suggested by the Examiner in the Office action and "information" at column 8, lines 35-45 are not comparable to and conflicts with Applicant's term "convention content information". Accordingly, the Salesky patent does not define, disclose, teach or suggest "convention content information" as specifically set forth in the independent claims of the present application. The use of the term "information" in the Salesky patent is mere naming or description of the communications conference server webcast process after the conferee is validated, and is not an assertedly anticipating reference and does not provide an enabling disclosure of the applicant's subject matter, which is comprehensively supported by functional descriptive material.

With respect to Applicant's claim 39, the Examiner references in Paragraph 41 of the Detailed Action that the Salesky patent also teaches c) receiving at the central website from the attendee client information necessary to register for the convention (col 8, lines 30-35, setup is performed via WWW). None of the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest methods and systems to "register for the convention" as specifically set forth in independent claim 39 of the present application. The Applicant's term "register", nor the term "registering" appear anywhere in the Salesky patent; and, there are many detailed differences between the invention of the present application and the above reference: (col 8, lines 30-35, setup is performed via WWW). At column 8, lines 30-35 of the Salesky patent the reader finds: "FIG. 2 is a flowchart showing the process of introducing a conferee client 17 (client 17 refers to a generic client which might also be a presenter client 12 or an attendee client 18) to a conference ongoing on server 14, assuming that the conference setup is performed via the WWW." (emphasis added). In addition to no use of the terms "register" or "registering" anyplace in the Salesky patent, the word "setup" used in this reference uses "the conference" as an adjective resulting in "the conference setup", and therefore, is not the same outcome as the Applicant's registration process for the attendee client in Applicant's claim 39. To setup is not the same as to register. Accordingly, the Salesky patent does not define, disclose, teach or suggest "receiving at the central website from the attendee client information necessary to register for the convention" in the present application.

In summary, the present invention provides for the creation of a virtual convention venue where the participating attendee client can search the *functional descriptive* material and experience a virtual navigational experience based on the convention operational control parameter rules, pre-set by the meeting planner clients and exhibitor clients. The claims are directed to association meeting planners and tradeshow organizers (i.e., the end-users) building online tradeshows interactively by themselves. The claimed invention solves many

{W0197374.1}

fundamental problems and introduces functions missing in early website work and patents, and is a significant contribution to the state of the art.

For the foregoing reasons, none of independent claims 1, 39 and 40 are anticipated by or rendered obvious over the prior art of record, whether used alone or in combination. In particular, the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest the method and system for conducting a convention, as specifically set forth in these claims. There is no hint or suggestion in any of the references cited by the Examiner to combine these references in a manner that would render the invention, as claimed, obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 39 and 40 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-38 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Further, claims 41 and 42 depend directly from independent claim 40 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 40.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-42 are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By_____
Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail:webblaw@webblaw.com

{W0197374.1}